

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/954,655	09/18/2001	John R. Williams	DR-326J	7504	
7	590 03/29/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Iandiorio & Teska			CYGAN, MICHAEL T		
260 Bear Hill Road Waltham, MA 02451-1018			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
waimam, iviA	02431-1018		2855		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			_M
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- '
Advisory Action	09/954,655	WILLIAMS ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Cygan	2855	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application applic	ation. A proper reply h places the applicat	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate or the final (opriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) They present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	S .
NOTE:			
3. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>See</u>		dered but does NOT	「place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approximately approximatel	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
10. Other:		Serving M)
		Michael Cygan Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2855)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments rely on unclaimed subject matter; to wit, a molecular imprinted sensor that changes resistance in response to interferents but not in response to the analyte. Accepted usage of the term "molecular imprinted sensor" usually indicates (as noted by applicant in the discussion of the prior art) that the target analyte has been removed from the sensor, and thus the sensor swells in response to contact with analytes. An amendment successfully including such terminology would distinguish the invention over the applied prior art; however, further search/consideration would be required to determine if such claims would be allowable, and such an amendment would not be entered. Piletsky does not teach away, since Piletsky teaches the direct comparison of the results of imprinted and non-imprinted sensors. Furthermore, Piletsky teaches determination the presence and concentration of the analyte, since analyte concentration is directly related to the signals.